Remarks/Arguments

Applicant thanks Examiner Mooneyham again for her careful examination of this application and for the clear explanation of the claim rejections. In response to the Office Action of April 4, 2007, applicant amends this application as follows:

1. Claim 1 is amended to add or amend the following limitations to the method:

    a. a step of testing a product;

    b. initiating and transmitting to the waiver request database a waiver request requesting a waiver if the tested device fails an element of the specification;

    c. transmitting responses from the plurality of responders via the waiver request database to the requestor; and

    d. shipping the product if the plurality of responders approve the waiver request.

2. Claims 2 through 5, claim 14, and claims 17 through 20 are canceled from this examination.

Claim 1

Claim 1 describes a method for processing specification waiver requests over a network. Applicant amended claim 1 to better describing the invention with additional limitations that includes a step of testing a product, a step of initiating and transmitting to a database a waiver request requesting a waiver if the tested device fails an element of the specification; and a step of shipping the product if the plurality of responders approve the waiver request.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being unpatentable over Anecki et al.[1] Applicant respectfully submits that the Anecki reference does not disclose these limitations.

The invention described in claim 1 is directed to testing a product and shipping the product, and initiating a waiver request when the product fails a test on a specific element of the specification. The invention greatly improves the cycle time over the current system, which requires "filling-out forms and getting signatures from all concerned organizations." Contrarily, the Anecki publication discloses systems and methods for interactively generating legal documents by a requestor for a recipient. The added and the amended limitations are not disclosed in the Anecki publication.

Claims 6 through claim 13

Claims 6 through 13 depend properly from claim 1. Because claim 1 stands patentable, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 through 14 also stand patentable at least by virtue of their dependence.

Claim 15

Claim 15, as amended in a previous response to the Office Action, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(b) as being unpatentable over the Anecki publication. The Final Office Action did not set forth any reason for the rejection. Applicant respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn or a more clear reason for the rejection be communicated to the applicant.

Claim 16

Claim 16 depends from claim 15. Applicant respectfully submits that if the rejection against claim 15 is improper, claim 16 stands patentable as well.

---

[1] U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0010377, published Jan. 12, 2006 from an application filed Sep. 13, 2005 by John A. Anecki et al.

In light of the amendment to claim 1 and the reason set forth above, applicant respectfully requests further examination of this application and timely allowance of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/Yingsheng Tung/

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P. O. Box 655474 MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75264
(972) 917-5355

Yingsheng Tung
Reg. No. 52,305
Attorney for Applicant